

U.N. PLANNING ANOTHER CHRISTIAN BLOODBATH

By J. JOHNSTON McCAULEY

Last year (12/16/65) a Washington publication reported a proposal that recommended nothing less than launching a full-scale aggressive war against the Union of South Africa — invasion of powerful military forces on land, sea and air. This proposal was circulated at the United Nations and among high personages in the Nation's Capital. It is entitled: APARTHEID AND UNITED NATIONS COLLECTIVE MEASURES: AN ANALYSIS. It was edited by Amelia C. Leiss and published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. This "peace" organization is located at the United Nations Plaza, and at one time headed by Alger Hiss, a convicted perjurer and identified as a Communist by Whittaker Chambers. A majority of its officers are members of the Council on Foreign Relations, which has been described as "the invisible government of our country."

Another startling paradox has emerged on the American scene: A tax-exempt peace organization has submitted a battle plan — a blue print for a UN military invasion of the Republic of South Africa.

The internal policies of this African Republic do not please the United Nations, and unfortunately our own country has seen fit to register its disapproval as well. Since arms boycotts have failed to compel South Africa to alter its domestic policy to one favored by the UN officials, and since some planners fear that even a complete boycott by the UN and blockade of South Africa would meet with the same results, there are indications of a plan to overthrow the South African government by force and violence.

What is so obnoxious about the internal policies of this African Republic? To fully comprehend the present antagonism which the "one-worlders" feel toward it, a brief glance at that nation is essential.

The Republic of South Africa has the only white, Christian, anti-Communist government on the African continent. It is the only African nation which has neither requested nor received foreign aid from us. It is one of the three countries in the entire world that has repaid its war debts. And in every conflict with Communist nations, this nation has been on our side.

Quite an impressive record, yet the paradox does not terminate. It is the only African nation toward which our government indicates obvious hostility. Our spokesmen at the UN have at times deliberately embarrassed, humiliated, harassed and insulted this anti-Marxist nation.

The question arises, why all this bitterness? Why this plan of a "peace organization" to overthrow this South African government when the UN and the U.S. are committed to peace?

This African nation has what is referred to as an APARTHEID policy — a separation of the whites and non-whites. The majority of the people support this policy as the best workable solution to their race problem.

American newsmen recently visited this country and were told by the Council on Indian Affairs, who represents Asiatics in that country, that social, economic and educational opportunities for non-Europeans are better in South Africa than anywhere else on the continent.

Simultaneously, the Council of Coloured Affairs — men representing those of mixed bloods — said that during the 200 years of racial integration — before the policy of apartheid — their people gained nothing. Conversely, they point to the rapid progress since apartheid was established. Opportunities have been given them to advance to the highest social, cultural and economic levels in the country.

Now the non-whites have four times more educational institutions than before apartheid — they have their own university to educate

and train their own people for the professions. And they have a policy which protects their businesses from competition with white and Asiatic businesses. In the face of such evidence, the UN has brought the full weight of its mighty anger to bear on this little country. To illustrate, on May 15, 1965, Paul G. Hoffman, managing director of the UN Special Fund, spoke to a 30-nation African Conference at Kampala, Uganda. (This Left-winger has held many high government positions, and is a most influential member of the Socialistic Council on Foreign Relations. He is married to Anna Rosenberg, who was identified as a Communist by Ralph DeSola, under oath.) He told these African leaders that all people and all governments should unite in a concerted effort to eliminate racial discrimination in South Africa — that they should "use pressure and the necessary measures to bring this about." And when he suggested using "pressures" on the government of South Africa, did he have in mind the battle plan suggested in the booklet published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace?

The plan for UN military invasion of this small African Republic calls for "massive direct military intervention" by 93 thousand UN troops. It calls for two divisions for amphibious assaults, 700 front line and transport air units, 60 to 70 warships, and 39 to 50 sea transports.

This Carnegie study provides a series of paradoxes. For example, editor Leiss thanks Major Sarkesian (U.S. Army) specifically for his aid in detailing "United Military measures — to achieve the goal of transforming the South African social and political structure." (The Major is assigned to the Department of Social Science at West Point).

Major Sarkesian served as a principal advisor and assistant in the preparation of the Carnegie peace plan for an international war against South Africa. All this in face of Pentagon muzzling of anti-military officers who dare to criticize the Soviet Union.

Other assistance came from two former State Department officials and present members of the Council on Foreign Relations — Vernon McKay and William O. Brown.

The study also suggests that the United States become aligned with the Soviet Union and with other nations as allies in the conflict. It even goes so far as to estimate how long it will take to beat South Africa to her knees — four months.

In order to accomplish this "peace" mission the study suggests that it will cost between 19 and 38 thousand killed and wounded UN forces. It takes into consideration public opinion and comes up with a possible solution. American Negroes, the publication suggests, might be encouraged to identify themselves, on a racial and emotional basis with alien Negroes — to create pressure on white Americans.

Here we have it, in the language of the study: "If American Negroes increasingly identify the struggle against apartheid with their domestic civil rights struggle, they could bring interest in the South African policy of the UN to a level seldom achieved by any foreign policy issue."

A study of the proposed plan, a study of Marxist goals for world domination, and even a casual knowledge of current events, make one realize that the Marxist ideologists are a determined people. So much so, in fact, that they will not rest until they have attempted to destroy the peace and order of any country whose internal policies displease them.

The lines have been sharply drawn between freedom and totalitarian forces. The blue prints for battle have been laid out, and marked for annihilation of everything that does not conform to the overall Marxist plan.

To compound the tragedy is the fact that a freedom-loving people have handed the

enemy one of its most effective tools for conquest — the United Nations — that world body whose troops, according to the study, would be used to compel the Republic of South Africa to adopt these internal policies pleasing to the United Nations.

The internal policies of the Republic of South Africa are not the legitimate concern of this country. The policy which is adopted toward this African nation is our worry. The policy which the UN adopts is equally our concern.

This presents another significant incident concerning the United Nations and Rhodesia. The UN adopted a resolution calling for the use of force to prevent Rhodesian independence. It is of great importance to observe that South Africa and Portugal were the only two countries which voted against this resolution, (all others favored force to prevent it).

We are now confronted with another paradox. This world body, the UN, which has pushed freedom for Africans in every instance thus far, and with almost uniformly tragic results, now comes up with a complete reversal on the question of Independence for Rhodesia.

It is regrettable to be compelled to state that this country supported the force resolution. The day following the overwhelming adoption of the resolution, our government announced that if Rhodesia should declare itself independent of Great Britain, we would simply refuse to recognize the new government.

Why should the United Nations and the United States, which have advocated so often and so loudly independence for any and all tribal groups in Africa (with the exception of Katanga), make such a complete reversal? Because the Rhodesian government, which is negotiating with England for independence, happens to be dominated by the white minority—not a group of individuals recently arrived to exploit the people and resources. They are, for the most part, members of families who have lived in that country for generations. They are among those who have helped the nation to be far more prosperous and further advanced economically than many of the other African "nations" which have recently gained independence.

In the face of all the chatter about equality, human dignity, and elimination of race prejudice and bigotry, the UN has voted 95 to 2, to use arms if necessary to keep the white man from power in any part of Africa. And our own government acquiesces.

Summing up this strange paradox, in applying the same standard of judgment to the United States, our government and the United Nations would have to conclude (and vote) that, even though the Europeans and Africans have been there for generations, only the native Indians have a right to govern this nation. Thus we see that principle has been "scrapped" in the case of Rhodesia — as is being proposed in the Republic of South Africa — and political and moral relativism and expedience have been enthroned at the United Nations. Our government's policy, and that of the UN concerning the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia—indeed, concerning any country in the world—are matters of vital concern to every liberty-loving person in the world. For we each share in the loss of freedom—no matter how slight and no matter in what remote part of the world it may be lost.

Wake Up,
AMERICA!